7

REMARKS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

In view of the objections raised in paragraph 2 of the Office Action the claims have been revised as suggested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In paragraph 3 the Examiner has rejected the application on the basis of Beck (US-6,230,197). With all due respect to the Examiner, we have extreme difficulty in understanding how the Examiner has arrived at this conclusion as Beck is completely irrelevant to the pending claim.

As identified by the Examiner the pending claim relates to a method of tracking user interaction which utilises a printed publication. In this regard, the printer publication includes coded data which is sensed by sensing a device when it is placed in an operative position relative to the printed publication. A computer system then receives the indicating data and identifies from this, and an electronic description, whether the user has selected an input element.

Having reviewed the Examiner's comments, we note the Examiner indicates that "the text version of an event must be machine-readable and human-readable". Whilst we acknowledge this, the document explicitly states a text version of an event. This therefore corresponds to text which is both human-readable and machine-readable. This does not in any way suggest both human-readable information and separate machine-readable coded data but rather only text which could be recognised using for example O.C.R. (optical character recognition). This document does not therefore describe providing machine-readable coded data and human-readable information.

This is in fact later acknowledged by the Examiner who then simply asserts such inclusion would be obvious. This is not the case, and given that the use of machine readable text is

                                        8

sufficient for the stated purposes in Beck, there is nothing that would lead a user to provide machine readable coded data.

The Examiner goes on to say that Beck shows "a method of tracking user interaction with an input element of the printed publication using a sensing device and a computer". This is simply incorrect.

Whilst the portions of the specification referred to by the Examiner mention text which may be machine-readable, and separately mention keeping track of customer interaction, there is nothing to suggest that the customer interactions are with the document which includes the machine-readable text. Thus, this does not correspond to user interaction with a printed publication.

In fact, as this document relates to multi-media call centre, we would submit that the customer is located remotely to the call centre, such as at the other end of a communications link, such as the Internet or a telephone network. Accordingly, the customer is unable to interact with the text version of an event which is being reviewed by an agent or knowledge worker at the call centre. This is physically impossible due to remote nature of the customer and the text document.

The Examiner goes on to acknowledge that Beck lacks an explicit disclosure of printed publication having human-readable and machine-readable coded data, and then makes similar comments about the remaining features of the claim. Effectively therefore the Examiner is stating that the claim is anticipated solely on the basis that Beck describes machine recognisable text. This is clearly as unsubstantiated and unsupportable position.

There is nothing within Beck that would lead a skilled person reading the document to include machine-readable coded data. There is nothing in the document which describes sensing coded data provided on a pre-printed publication. The only reference to any form of computer based recognition that can be found is reference to machine-readable text.

Moving on from this, even if the above discussed elements were shown, there is absolutely nothing to teach or suggest that machine-readable coded data may be indicative of its own position relative to the pre-printed publication. There is also nothing to teach or suggest a

Appln No. 10/743,671
Amdt. Dated March 11, 2005
Response to Office Action of January 27, 2005

9

sensing device which may be placed in an operative position relative to the publication to sense the coded data. Consequently, there is nothing to teach or suggest generating indicating data based on sensed coded data, or that the indicating data being indicative of the position or movement of the sensing device relative to the printed publication.

Similarly there is nothing to teach or suggest that the computer system uses indicating data received from a sensing device to identify selection of an input element by a user.

In fact, there is nothing within Beck to teach or suggest any of the elements of the claim and we therefore do not believe Beck is relevant to the claim.

If the Examiner is minded to maintain his objection, we request that the Examiner explicitly direct us towards portions of Beck which show these features and merely list irrelevant portions of the specification.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 14, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant: _____

KIA SILVERBROOK

Applicant: _____

PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street

10

Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:　　　　kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:　　+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:　　+61 2 9555 7762